

Dear Jim,

10/4/72

Because of your obvious concern and more than justified emotion, I make immediate response to your letter of the 29th, which didn't arrive until today. I now see why. You mailed it after you got to Houston. I can't respond to all of it, but I'll address what I think can be helpful to you and to your understanding.

First, I suggest that you forget all about trying to work with or for Garrison. By now you know it would be an impossible situation if you connected. I say the same thing about his so-called investigation, a frivolity where it was not a fiction, as I learned only late. There is nothing you can write that wouldn't hurt, wouldn't impede establishing truth, wouldn't indirectly defame those who have done the work he didn't and doing what he can't and won't. You still do not understand him. He is sick in the head. It is that simple. Not evil, not stupid, but sick and ridden by an incredible ego. It is a tragedy because he does have a fine mind and his writing is magnificent.

You have seen the superficial aspects only of what I consider weird in that office and I feel it would be wrong to go into further detail when I have only valid suspicions, not answers or proofs. I'm not seeking either, but the suspicions, while I didn't go out and look for them, couldn't be avoided. There are still bad influences within the office.

Even the assistant DAs often didn't know when Jim was in the office. Ivon did because a detective under him was the chauffeur, generally but not always Bordelon. I knew Schuler had quit. She was gone last November when I was there.

Now there is something I would like you to bear in mind, not to go off and do something about. What you report of what Cecil Robertson and Cecil Shilstone said at the hearing was unknown to me. A friend sends me relevant clippings from the L.O. papers, but from a point far from N.O. They reach me late. I have not met and know nothing about these two men or their associates. I do believe they and the others are the real targets of the Shaw civil suit. I also believe that if they depend upon Garrison for their defense in this matter, they are lost. They are wealthy men, Shaw can collect from them, and I don't want them hurt. They acted from a sense of public responsibility, I am sure, not to hurt Shaw. I have what I consider more than just relevant. I believe it can be close to a total defense. Because I am also satisfied that Shaw's lawyers are the cause of his suit, their hope of recouping their real expenses and those they can charge, I spoke to Sal Panzeca about this either when you were not with me or after you left to see your brother. I was pretty frank with Sal, but he was determined to press the civil suit.

What I have I have not given to Garrison. There is a perjury case, and against more than Shaw. Garrison, who had never done the minimum work, didn't have it and doesn't. I do. It is not a rehash of what was presented to the jury. Garrison was not happy about the letter I wrote him when he charged Shaw in such irresponsible speed.

So, there are these possibilities: you know somebody well who knows one of them well; or, at the appropriate time in the future, I may want you to go and speak to one of them in person. I can't dream of spending money for a ticket. If you do know someone well enough, I'd like to ascertain if they or probably more important, their lawyers, if these are other than Garrison's, are interested. I have interviewed the personally-involved witnesses, and I have all of it on tape. I also have in my possession relevant FBI reports. Most people presume that if a private person has FBI reports there was hanky-panky. Not so. I got these quite properly.

I should also make clear that Garrison doesn't even know the nature of what I have. I haven't told him and I don't intend to, except if it is necessary for the defense of the innocent, and I can't get it to them any other way. Nobody can collect anything from Jim. He doesn't have anything. I don't believe he took any graft, certainly not small stuff. He probably spent his own money on his "probe". I'm sure his home is mortgaged to the hilt.

I can also give them a pretty good idea of how their money was spent - and wasn't. Jim owes me something like \$1,000 I spent for him in this, but if he had merely pissed away some of their money, it would have been less hurtful. I was aware of much of this from the start, but not the expenditure of the money until it was too late, after it was spent. But relatively large sums of which I have knowledge were spent by people I know and on stupidities of which I also know. In fact, I have the "confessions" of one.

are you beginning to see how mature people like your father, experienced in the normal ways of the normal world, can be turned off on the entire subject by insanities like these? The average good lawyer, having no independent knowledge, has to puke in his mind over this kind of terrible stuff.

Ivon: I've heard nothing since before you called. I've had and expected no answer to my letter. As I recall its purpose, it was an effort to have him stop playing games with you, imposing upon you, your time and your limited resources.

Don't waste time trying to get the transcripts for me. If you are there again and want to ask Louis about xeroxing them, fine. Let him give you some half-assed excuse or be embarrassed into saying o.k. My own belief is that in this he is following Jim's direct order. I see what Jim doesn't, understand what he fails to, do what he can't, and this is all he needs to dislike me. It is that simple, given the emotional state in which he is and has been. He is a lemming.

Don't reprimand. You blew nothing.

By the way, your old friend Butler is raising his nasty head again. He is into Pat Frawley for a rerun of those incredibly bad "Square TV programs. There was a story in the States-Item, when Ochsner got an award. If you can, keep an eye on this, please.

I have Stang's piece from American Opinion from the Congressional Record. It was put in in two pieces, one by Schmitz and one by Ashbrook. If there is anything since this original piece, I don't have it and would like it.

I was not aware that you had been denied admission into law school over your statements on the political assassinations. If you ever decide to reapply and these things will be evaluated fairly and honestly by any law school, I think I may be able to help by validating them.

Lunch is ready, so I have to stop. If there is anything to which I haven't responded that you want me to address, please let me know.

When you were last in Houston I asked you if you know anyone who is not a friend of Percy Foreman. It would have been better to ask if you know anyone who regards him as other than a boon to the profession of the law. And there is the added thing, could you find time to check, with utmost circumspection, whether he made any court appearances between just before Christmas 1968 and early February 1969. DO NOT consider this without speaking to your father. If he disapproves or considers that you might be hurt, then don't do it. If he is friendly with Foreman, don't present him with a conflict by asking him. However, if he has no objection, he can probably tell you how you can check, and it must be unobtrusive. All I care about is the simple fact: did he make any courtroom appearances. He is pretty farout. He has made appearances on a stretcher, delivered by ambulance!

Thanks and best,